## REMARKS

The Office Action mailed March 6, 2006 has been received and reviewed. In the Office Action, the examiner rejects claims 1 and 2 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,689,326 to Jackson ("Jackson"). Claims 3-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. However, the examiner asserts that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully thanks the examiner for the allowable subject matter. In this Amendment, claims 1-10 have been amended for clarification purposes (e.g., to improve readability and grammar) without significantly effecting the content or scope of the claims. Applicant submits that these amendments are supported in the specification and add no new matter.

In the Office Action, the examiner suggests that claim 1 would be allowable over the art of record if amended to recite "a pump system for pumping water from one or more CBM wells to a reservoir, a recirculation loop including the reservoir, a pump, and a solid-based sulfurous acid generator, a discharge line leading from the reservoir, and an injector connected to the discharge line for injecting gypsum into the discharge line." Applicant thanks the examiner for these suggestions.

Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, recites elements comparable to those suggested by the examiner in the Office Action. Applicant further submits that Jackson fails to anticipate the elements of claim 1. For a prior art reference to anticipate, every element of the claimed invention must be identically disclosed in a single prior art reference; and those elements must be arranged or connected together in a single reference in the same way as specified in the patent claim. MPEP § 2131.

Jackson fails to disclose all the elements "arranged or connected together.. in the same way" required by newly amended claim 1. In particular, Jackson at least fails to disclose "an injection system to inject soluble gypsum into at least one of the aqueous sulfurous acid and the coal-bed-methane water," as required by claim 1. Although Jackson discloses an injector 310 as indicated by the examiner, this injector is used to either draw sulfur gases into a pressurized system (See Figure 4A, 4C, and column 14, lines 46-50) or to draw sulfurous acid into a body of water (See Figures 2, 3, and column 20, lines 6-12). This is distinct from the injector of claim 1, which is used to inject gypsum into either the "aqueous sulfurous acid" or the "coal-bed-methane water." In other words, Jackson's injector is "arranged or connected" in a different manner than Applicant's injector. Furthermore, Jackson's injector could not be used to inject soluble gypsum into either the aqueous sulfurous acid or coal-bed-methane water, as required by claim 1, since it is used for a different purpose. Thus, Jackson fails to anticipate claim 1.

With respect to newly amended claim 2, Applicant finds no reference in Jackson of "a control system to control a water flow rate through the generator to achieve a desired concentration of sulfurous acid." Although Jackson discloses one or more pumps 280, 290 as the examiner indicates, Jackson does not teach a control system capable of adjusting the flow rate through these pumps. Thus, Jackson fails to anticipate claim 2. Further, Applicant submits that claim 2 is also allowable at least due to its direct dependency from claim 1.

Applicants assert that the claims, as currently amended, are in condition for allowance. In the event that the examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of any of these claims, which could be clarified in a telephone conference, the examiner is respectfully urged to initiate the same with the undersigned.

DATED this day of June, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

A. John Pate

Attorney for Applicant

Date: June 6, 2006

PATE PIERCE & BAIRD 550 Parkside Tower 215 South State Street Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 Telephone: (801) 530-0330

Facsimile: (801) 530-5955